

Adapted from J. P. Hale
MODERN "DEMOCRACY," THE ALLY OF SLAVERY.

SPEECH OF HON. M. W. TAPPAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

JULY 29, 1856,

The House being in the Committee of the Whole, on the state of the Union,

Mr. TAPPAN said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I desire, in the brief time that is allotted me, to discuss the great question of Slavery extension, which is now presented to the American people for their decision, and to examine some of the new, and, as it seems to me, alarming phases, which the party calling itself "Democratic" has recently assumed on this subject.

For the first time in the history of this Government, the issue is fairly made up between the power of Slavery on the one hand, and the principles of Liberty on the other. One or the other must yield. Nor do I regret that the issue has come. From the alarming strides which the Slave Power has made—from the vaunting pretensions it has put forth, it is but too apparent that this question has got sometime to be met and settled. It may as well be done now, in the coming campaign, as ever. The longer it is postponed, the more difficult its solution becomes, the more Slavery is strengthened, and the less qualified will the people of the free States find themselves to grapple with a power that is undermining the foundations of Liberty and the Constitution. The "Democracy" have flung their Slavery standard to the breeze, and proclaimed that the Presidential battle is to be fought on the policy of the Nebraska bill, and the new doctrine of the "equality of the States"—which means simply, as I shall endeavor to show, the right of slave owners to go where they please with their human chattels, carrying with them the sanction and protection of law. For one, I am ready to meet them on this issue, and fight the battle on their chosen ground. I believe the people of the free States, driven to the wall as they have been, are at last aroused, and ready to accept the issue thus tendered.

To adopt the language of the *Union news*

paper, a day or two since, I too say, "Let it come, and let it come now!"

Mr. WRIGHT, of Mississippi, (interrupting.) The gentleman says, if I understand him correctly, that the Democracy of this Government has inaugurated a new doctrine—the equality of States. I desire, in the first place, to ask the gentleman, whether or not, at the time of the foundation of the Federal Constitution, each State did come into the Union as equal?

Mr. TAPPAN. I think I shall answer that question as I go along.

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, I desire to ask another question. The gentleman states that the great issues now, not only within the limits of the United States, but the great issues to be presented to the enlightened world, were, whether or not the institution of Slavery was to be maintained in this Government, or whether the arm of the Government was to be levelled against the institution of Slavery.

Mr. TAPPAN. No; I stated the issue to be whether Slavery should be extended into territory now free. That is the great question.

Mr. WRIGHT. Whether it shall be extended?

Mr. TAPPAN. Yes; but I do not like to be interrupted, unless it be absolutely necessary.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman, but I wanted to understand him.

Mr. TAPPAN. It is quite time that the free people of this country understood whether the policy of this Government is to be that of upholding, strengthening, and extending, a system condemned by the entire civilized world, or whether it is to return to the earlier and better policy of the fathers of the Republic—whether the original idea of LIBERTY, which animated its founders, is to be carried out, or whether the Slave Oligarchy is forever to rule and control the destinies of this nation. It is full time that it were ascertained whether the experiment of a Republic, founded in the hopes and prayers, and sealed with the blood of wise and good

18 JULY 1991

Special Collections
Anti-Slavery

men—having its early inception in the principles of Human Freedom, and in the equal rights of all men, is to continue a beacon for the guidance of other nations, struggling to be free; or whether the lustre of its example is to be dimmed by presenting to the world a Government controlled by the single idea of finding "room" for a system which converts men and women into property, and separates children from their parents at the auction block? I repeat it, sir, let the issue be fairly met. The course which every true lover of his country should take, in such a crisis, ought not to be a matter of hesitation; nor, in my judgment, can the result be doubtful; for I believe, with Mr. Jefferson, that the "Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with *Slavery* in such a contest!" As little do I apprehend any of those direful consequences to the UNION, so slipperily predicted by a certain class of politicians, when the policy which we of the free States contend for shall ultimately triumph. Sir, the people of the free States do not seek to invade or trench upon any of the reserved rights of the South, or to interfere with the institution of *Slavery* any further than is warranted by the Constitution. On the Constitution we take our stand; and believing that under that instrument we have the power and the right to prevent its further spread and extension, we intend, by all lawful and proper means, to bring about that result. The constitutional right to prohibit *Slavery* in the Territories has been exercised too long—sanctioned as it has been by a long course of practice under every Administration of the Government, from Washington to Polk—to now be questioned. Therefore, when we assert our intention to adhere to this time-honored policy, and say to *Slavery*, "thus far, but no further," we intend neither to dissolve the Union ourselves, nor suffer it to be dissolved by others.

Sir, what is the history of *Slavery* prohibition in the Territories? I can barely glance at its rise and progress, as I pass on to other matters. Mr. Jefferson himself is the author of this legislation. And if the doctrine we now contend for be treason, then was Mr. Jefferson a traitor! On the first day of March, 1784, a committee, consisting of Mr. Jefferson of Virginia, Mr. Chase of Maryland, and Mr. Howell of Rhode Island, submitted to Congress a plan for the government of "the territory ceded, or to be ceded, by individual States to the United States," embracing all the territory between the thirty-first degree of north latitude, which was then the southern boundary of the United States, and the northern line of the United States, extending westwardly to the Mississippi river. This plan provided, among other things, that said territory should be divided into nine States, designating them by name, and defining the particular boundaries of each. It also contained the following provision, which has been the basis of all the subsequent Anti-*Slavery* legislation in regard to the Territories:

"That after the year 1800 of the Christian era, there shall be neither *Slavery* nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted to have been personally guilty."

On a motion to strike out this provision, sixteen, among whom was Mr. Jefferson, voted to retain it; and seven voted against it. It lacked one vote of the requisite number—the full vote of seven States being required to retain it. Three years later, however, it was incorporated into the celebrated Ordinance of 1787, which applied to the Territories northwest of the Ohio. It is a remarkable fact, Mr. Chairman, as will be seen by a glance at the map, that if the far-seeing and sagacious policy of Mr. Jefferson, contained in this provision, had prevailed in 1784, under its operation the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky, would now have been free States! That the policy thus initiated would have been advantageous to the States just named, a comparison between the thrift, enterprise, and prosperity of those States, and the great free States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, formed out of the Northwest Territory, under the Anti-*Slavery* Ordinance of 1787, will conclusively establish. That it would have been better for the destiny of the Republic, let the fierce struggle between the antagonist principles of Liberty and *Slavery*, which now convulses the country, bear witness!

Mr. Chairman, the Fremont party, to-day, are only contending for the application of the same principle to Kansas, which Mr. Jefferson proposed for all the Territories of the United States, in 1784!

That Mr. Jefferson retained his Anti-*Slavery* sentiments down to the period of his death, is apparent from a letter which he wrote, a short time previous to that event, to James Heaton, of Ohio, in reply to one from that gentleman, making inquiries as to his views on the subject of *Slavery*. The letter bears date May 20, 1826, and Mr. Jefferson died on the 4th of July of the same year. The original letter, in the handwriting of Mr. Jefferson, is now in the possession of my friend from Ohio, [Mr. CAMPBELL.] It will be seen from the letter, a copy of which is subjoined, that Mr. Jefferson refers to his opinions dating as far back as this plan of 1784:

"MONTICELLO, May 20, 1826.

"DEAR SIR: Persuasion, perseverance, and patience, are the best advocates on questions depending upon the will of others. The revolution in public opinion, which this case requires, is not to be expected in a day, or perhaps in an age; but time, which outlives all things, will outlive this evil also. My sentiments have been forty years before the public. Had I repeated them forty times, they would have only become the more stale and threadbare. Although I shall not live to see them

'consummated, they will not die with me; but, living or dying, they will ever be in my most fervent prayers. This is written for yourself, and not for the public, in compliance with your request for two lines of sentiment on the subject. Accept the assurance of my good will and respect, THOMAS JEFFERSON."

But to return to the history of this legislation.

On the 13th of July, 1787, Congress passed the celebrated Ordinance of '87, containing, as we have seen, substantially the same provision. This Ordinance passed almost unanimously—receiving the vote of *all the members of every Southern State* represented in that Congress, as it did the vote of every Free State member, with but one exception from the State of New York.

The very first Congress under the Constitution, in the year 1789, recognised and confirmed this Ordinance of 1787. This doctrine, as I have said, has been sanctioned and approved by every President, from Washington down to the Administration of Franklin Pierce, under whose disastrous reign a new and false light seems suddenly to have burst upon the country.

The act of 1789 was approved by Washington. In the year 1800, Congress established a Territorial Government over the Territory of Indiana, which was approved by John Adams. In 1805, over the Territory of Michigan; in 1809, over the Territory of Illinois—both approved by Thomas Jefferson. In 1834, the jurisdiction of Michigan was extended over Wisconsin and Iowa, and the act was approved by Andrew Jackson. In 1836, a Territorial Government was established over Wisconsin, and, in 1838, over the Territory of Iowa, both approved by President Van Buren. In 1848, over the Territory of Oregon, approved by James K. Polk, Mr. Buchanan himself being a member of his Cabinet; and in March, 1853, over the Territory of Washington, approved by Millard Fillmore. IN ALL THE ABOVE ACTS, THE ANTI-SLAVERY PROVISION OF THE ORDINANCE OF '87 WAS INCORPORATED, AND SLAVERY EXPRESSLY PROHIBITED.

There are many other acts where this prohibition is recognised, but I need not multiply proofs. Such is the origin and in part the history of Slavery prohibition in the Territories. It has been sanctioned by innumerable acts of the national Legislature, and recognised by many judicial decisions. Sir, it is too late to deny its constitutionality, and too late, in view of the blessings which have followed its application to the great and glorious States of the Northwest, to doubt its expediency. And yet, because the people of the free States propose now to stand by this revered and time-honored doctrine—going no further than every Democratic Administration has gone—because they are fully determined that the Slave Power

shall take nothing by the wanton and "ruthless" repeal of the Missouri restriction, by which this old and well-settled policy of the Government was broken down and abrogated, we are denounced as "traitors," "Black Republicans," and enemies to the Union! Sir, standing before the country and the world on such an issue, we stand strong. We can well afford to let our opponents abuse us with opprobrious epithets, and throw out threats to dissolve the Union! But these threats have been made once too often. They have lost their power. Let any portion of the Confederacy attempt a dissolution of the Union for reasons such as these, and its only effect would be to cover its authors with shame and confusion, and to overwhelm them with the contempt of the civilized world! No; our position is constitutional—it has the sanction of long precedent—it is impregnable! And with

"Hearts within, and God o'erhead,"

we move onward to a certain triumph.

Sir, this Government, instead of following on in the path of liberty prescribed by its founders, is completely controlled by the Slave Power—and this, too, under the guise and in the hallowed name of "Democracy!" At the commencement, a little cloud, scarcely bigger than a man's hand, deplored by all the great men of our early history as an evil only to be tolerated for a brief time, until measures could be taken for its extinction—acknowledged as a crime against humanity—Slavery, to-day, has grown to such dimensions as to become the supreme power in the State, and contends for the mastery over the very principles which called this Government into being! And the question to-day is, not whether Slavery shall some time be abolished, but whether there is to be any such thing as Freedom in any portion of our country? The inquiry has been repeatedly made by Southern gentlemen, during the present session of Congress, as to what is meant by the "Slave Power?" as though it was something that existed merely in the distempered imaginations of Northern men. Sir, I will attempt to answer this question, and show what I understand by the "Slave Power."

And, in the first place, let me say that I do not mean the Southern States, as States; nor the entire people of the South. I know that gentlemen are in the habit, when speaking upon this question, to talk about the "South," and what the "South" will or will not do, in certain contingencies. I know, too, the power which the slave-owners exercise over public opinion in the Southern States; but I question the right of those who represent Slavery merely, to speak for the entire people of the South; for I am well aware that there are vast numbers of people in the Southern portion of the Union (moderate, conservative, and influential men) who have no sympathy with the ultra schemes of the

Slavery propaganda. But this class of men, slaveholders though some of them may be, have no weight now in the South. They are completely overborne by the *governing* class there. The despotism exercised over all those who doubt the divinity of Slavery, and over the entire portion of non-slaveholding whites in that section, is as complete as that of the master over his slave! If such an one goes into a Northern State even, and openly avows opinions hostile to Slavery, so soon as this becomes known at home, he is a *marked*, if not a doomed man, and in many instances is obliged to quit the State of his birth, and seek a home elsewhere. It needs but a change of the Administration from the hands of the slave-Democracy to those of one less "sectional"—having an eye to the welfare of the *whole* Union, instead of the advancement of the interests of a *favoured class*—to call into action the latent conservative public sentiment of the Southern States. When this is done, it will be found that the North and the South are not as wide apart as many people now imagine.

But, sir, by the "Slave Power" I mean the power wielded by three hundred and forty-seven thousand slave-owners, representing a moneyed interest amounting, according to the estimate of the honorable gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. SHORTER,] in a recent speech on this floor, to *two thousand millions of dollars!* Mr. Clay, some years ago, estimated the value of property in slaves at \$1,200,000,000; and I suppose that the estimate of the gentleman from Alabama cannot, at the present time, be very far from correct. In ascertaining the number of slave-owners, however, who constitute the Slave Power," large deductions should be made from the whole number set down in the last census as owning property of this description. The actual number of slave-owners, as shown by the census, is three hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred and twenty-five. Of these, sixty-eight thousand eight hundred and twenty own but a single slave; and one hundred and five thousand six hundred and eighty-three own less than five. Of these is included, also, all those who *hire* slaves; and it is safe to assert that those who own, as house servants and other domestics, no more than five slaves, have no particular interest in the perpetuation of the system. Deduction should also be made for slaves owned by women and minors; so that the entire slave oligarchy at the South, on the most liberal calculation, cannot exceed the number of about two hundred thousand! and yet, as I shall show, this comparatively insignificant number of men completely rule and govern twenty millions of people. The following table, prepared from the census returns, showing the number of slaveholders, and the whole amount of white population in each of the Southern States, will exhibit the proportion between the two classes:

States.	Slaveholders in each.	White population.
Alabama	29,295	427,513
Arkansas	5,999	162,189
District of Columbia	1,477	37,941
Delaware	809	71,169
Florida	3,520	47,203
Georgia	38,456	521,592
Kentucky	38,385	761,413
Louisiana	20,670	255,491
Maryland	16,040	417,943
Mississippi	23,116	394,718
Missouri	19,189	692,006
North Carolina	28,303	553,028
South Carolina	25,596	274,563
Tennessee	23,864	756,836
Texas	7,747	154,634
Virginia	55,063	894,800
Total	347,525	6,222,318

From this it will be seen that there is not a slaveholding State in the Union in which the slaveholders constitute *one tenth part* of the aggregate free white population, and in some of them not one thirtieth part! And yet, in every one of these States the slaveholders wield the whole political power; set up, and pull down, whomsoever they please; make just such laws as their "peculiar" interests require; and hold the great body of non-slaveholding whites in complete subservency to their despotic rule! Ay, sir, they not only reign supreme at home, but they dictate the entire policy of the UNION!

We have a great deal to say in this country against "aristocracy;" and grow very patriotic over the fact that we have no "privileged classes" here; but where, on the face of the earth, is there an "aristocracy" so exclusive as the "aristocracy" of Slavery?—where a "privileged class" that arrogates so much superiority over other men?—where a class that wields so much power, both social and political, as the Black Power of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, the power wielded by large combinations of capital is well known. We know how justly jealous are the people of this country of such combinations. No interest has been subjected to greater scrutiny, or regarded with a more watchful eye by the people, than corporations having for their object, by means of associated wealth, the carrying out of any great purpose whatsoever. This jealousy is a natural one, for all such combinations are liable to gross abuses. There is nothing that great wealth cannot accomplish; and there is no political party so strong, and no interest so potent, as to withstand the persistence and combined influence of the *money power*. It was justly complained of the old United States Bank, that it exerted a corrupt influence in the elections. It was said that it used its large means to retain in its interest many of the influential men of the country, and that there could be no fair expression of the public will where its influence was brought to bear. The whole power of the

Democratic party, under the lead of Gen. Jackson, was arrayed against it. The land resounded with the blows inflicted upon the "monster," and it fell! In some localities, even at this day, the ghost of the old United States Bank is still used to frighten men from their political propriety! But what, let me inquire, is the influence of such a corporation, with a capital of a few millions of dollars, watched by the jealous eyes of the people, and amenable to the laws, compared to the almost almighty influence of an institution whose advocates are held together by common ties, actuated by a common purpose, intent upon a common object, (to wit: its perpetuation and extension,) with a capital of *two thousand millions of dollars*? Such is the "Slave Power." It is a unit. On all questions touching Slavery, men of all parties who represent this interest act together. All political differences yield, when this interest is touched. Against such a combination, based upon such a vast amount of aggregated wealth, no power, save a similar union of the entire Free State interest, can oppose any barrier to its onward progress! And why is it not equally lawful and proper for the people who prefer *free* institutions to unite—not for the purpose, I repeat, of encroaching upon any of the rights of the slave States, but to preserve their own?—not to abolish Slavery where it exists under the sanction of State law, but to prevent those great principles of Liberty, which had their birth in the American Revolution, from being entirely "crushed out and subdued" in the very heart of the North? not to subvert the Union and the Constitution, but to preserve the Territories of the nation, yet unmoistened by the sweat of the slave, to the FREE LABOR of the country, which constitutes the greatest element of its prosperity, its strength, and its future glory?

Now, Mr. Chairman, where stands the so-called "Democratic" party in reference to this great question? *It is leagued with the Slave Power against the interests of Freedom.* Time has been when the word "Democracy" meant something. The Democratic party came into existence the sworn foe of all monopolies, and of all systems that looked to the aggrandizement of one class at the expense of another. It took the side of the people, as against the power of capital. Its peculiar boast was, that it went for the rights of man, rather than of money. But to-day it is the champion of the worst monopoly that ever cursed the earth, and the ALLY of a system that tramples upon the rights of human nature, and crushes and degrades the free labor of the land. Guided by the counsels of men who were not long ago its bitterest enemies, renegades from the ranks of its life-long opponent, and shorn of its strength by the unnatural alliance—its old leaders, at whose bugle-blast it was wont to march forth to victory, either silent, or openly arrayed against it—the Democratic organization is to-day but a vast machine to register

the behests of the Slave Power! Although Slavery is the very antipodes of true Democracy, it yet projects itself upon the Democratic organization, and, by virtue of the prestige of its once honored name, it has gone forth from conquering to conquer. Northern men, leaders in the ranks of the "Democracy," for the sake of the spoils of office, are found servile enough to prostitute its principles, and bring reproach upon the Democratic name, by lending themselves willing tools to all the purposes of the Slave Propaganda! It is by the aid of such men that the interests of Freedom are betrayed and stricken down.

Sir, for thus seeking to strengthen and sustain their "peculiar institution," there is, perhaps, for the Southern slaveholders, something to be said by way of extenuation. As compared with their Northern allies and tools in the art of covenant breaking, we can even look with some degree of complacency upon the flagrant breach of plighted faith which has wrested from the free States the territory set apart to them. Born, reared, and educated, in the midst of Slavery—seeing, as they do, that it stamps into the very soil whereon it is planted the seeds of decay and death, it is perhaps to be expected that they should covet new fields for its operations. But for the treachery of Northern "Democrats"—men reared among the hills and mountains of the free North, who,

"Where thrift may follow fawning,"

are pandering to the Power that would perpetuate this foul blot upon our country's fame, and extend its curse over the virgin fields of Kansas, even at the expense of drenching her plains in the blood of her Free State settlers—no words of condemnation are too severe, and no language is sufficiently strong to properly characterize the act! And it is the Northern "Democracy" who are relied upon, in the coming election, to settle forever the principle that the institutions of Slavery have the same rights in our National Territories as those of Freedom! The Charleston (S. C.) *Mercury* has well presented the issue now before the country. In a recent number of that paper, it says:

"The ensuing Presidential canvass, which will probably determine the fate of the Union, will turn almost solely on the question of *State equality*. None can consistently or effectively contend for *State equality*, who do not hold that the institutions of the South, and the social forms of the South, are equally rightful, legitimate, moral, and promotive of human happiness and well being, with those of the North. If slave society be inferior in these respects to free society, we of the South are wrong and criminal in proposing to extend it into new territory, and the North right in exerting itself to the utmost to prevent such extension."

I propose to show, Mr. Chairman, before I close, that the only plank in the Democratic

platform which has any significance at all, is the one shadowed forth in the above extract; that, if the so-called Democracy prevail, the doctrine that "the institutions of the South, and the social forms of the South, are equally rightful, legitimate, moral, and promotive of human happiness and well-being, with those of the North," will become forever hereafter the settled policy of the nation.

But I desire to present one further extract from one of the foremost and leading presses in favor of Mr. Buchanan for the Presidency, to show what the real issue before the country now is, and how that issue is understood at the South. I quote from a recent article in the Richmond *Enquirer*:

"THE TRUE ISSUE.—The Democrats of the South in the present canvass cannot rely on the old grounds of defence and excuse for Slavery; *for they seek not merely to retain it where it is, but to extend it into regions where it is unknown. Much less can they rely on the mere constitutional guaranties of Slavery,* for such reliance is pregnant with the admission that Slavery is wrong, and, but for the Constitution, should be abolished. This constitutional argument for Slavery, standing alone, fully justifies the Abolitionists.

"Nor will it avail us aught to show that the negro is most happy and best situated in the condition of Slavery. If we stop there, we weaken our cause by the very argument intended to advance it; *for we propose to introduce into new territory human beings whom we assert to be unfit for liberty, self-government, and equal association with other men. We must go a step further. We must show that African Slavery is a moral, religious, natural, and probably, in the general, a necessary institution of society. This is the only line of argument that will enable Southern Democrats to maintain the doctrines of State equality and Slavery extension.*

"For if Slavery be not a legitimate, useful, moral, and expedient institution, we cannot, without reproof of conscience and the blush of shame, seek to extend it, or assert our equality with those States having no such institution.

"Northern Democrats need not go thus far. They do not seek to extend Slavery, but only agree to its extension as a matter of right on our part.

"We know that we utter bold truths. But the time has now arrived when their utterance can be no longer postponed. The true issue should stand out so boldly and clearly that none may mistake it."

Here we have the doctrine of "State equality," as incorporated in the Democratic platform at Cincinnati, again defined, and from the same source that brought forward Mr. Buchanan for the Presidency. For Virginia was for Buchanan from the start, as it was for Pierce in 1852.

The Slave Power used General Pierce till it made him so odious that it dare not run him for a second heat, and so have taken up a new man, in the hope of again deceiving the people of the free States! The issue is boldly presented; for, says the *Enquirer*, it is a "moral, religious, natural, and a necessary institution of society;" and "THE DEMOCRATS OF THE SOUTH SEEK NOT MERELY TO RETAIN IT WHERE IT IS, BUT TO EXTEND IT INTO REGIONS WHERE IT IS UNKNOWN," and "NORTHERN DEMOCRATS AGREE TO ITS EXTENSION AS A MATTER OF RIGHT ON OUR PART!" That the Northern Democrats do so agree is most true, and I shall present the proof that will put the fact beyond dispute. Let the Liberty-loving people of the free States meet the issue as boldly as it is presented! With such an issue, how do the "Democracy" propose to carry the next Presidential election? Not by presenting to the country a broad national platform, upon which all sections of the country—North as well as South—can stand with some show of self-respect, but by an intensely sectional one, embracing but a single idea—the equality of Slavery. Not by an honest appeal to all classes in the country to rally to the ancient standard of Democratic faith, but by uniting, to a man, the "PRIVILEGED CLASS" in the South, (those whose privilege it is to buy and sell their laborers, and live upon their unpaid toil,) so as to carry *every Southern State*; and then, trusting to official patronage, party discipline, and the treachery of Northern "doughfaces," to make up from the free States the twenty-nine votes requisite to give them a majority in the electoral college. And yet, with this odious sectional issue, forced upon the country and made the test of Democratic faith by the Slave Power, (for, as was said the other evening by the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. BARKSDALE,] every one who does not conform to this standard has no claim to be called a "Democrat,") to be carried through, if at all, by sectional appeals—this same "Democratic" party has the effrontery to charge the people's party—a party which stands upon the broad, national policy adopted by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin—with being a "sectional party," and seeking to divide the Union!

The better to show the alarming strides which the Democratic party have taken on this Slavery question, I desire to call attention to the position it has but recently occupied in reference to it, for the purpose of contrasting it with the platform upon which it stands to-day. Sir, it is scarcely six years since the entire Democratic party of the North stood precisely where we now stand, and contended for the same doctrine which the party now denounced by them as "Black Republicans" contend for in the present campaign! In 1847, '48, '49, and '50, the Democratic party in the free States stood upon the ground of the Wilmot

Proviso. The prohibition of Slavery in the Territories was then a prominent article in the Democratic creed. Even Mr. Buchanan, at that time, admitted the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of Slavery in the Territories. In his letter to Mr. Sanford, dated August 21, 1848, he says:

"Having urged the adoption of the Missouri Compromise, the inference is irresistible, that Congress, in my opinion, possesses the power to legislate upon the subject of Slavery in the Territories."

The right to legislate upon the subject at all, is now denied by the party whose platform Mr. Buchanan claims to be the embodiment.

I shall not attempt, at this time, Mr. Chairman, to quote from Democratic resolutions passed in nearly or quite all the Northern States, but content myself with giving a few extracts from those adopted by the Legislature of New Hampshire, as a sample of the whole. The soundness and orthodoxy of New Hampshire Democracy, I suppose, will not be questioned, especially as it was under the lead of the present President of the United States, during the whole time to which I shall refer! In 1817, the Legislature of that State, being strongly Democratic, passed the following resolutions:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That we regard the institution of Slavery as a moral, social, and political evil, and, as such, we deeply regret its existence, and are willing to concur in all reasonable and constitutional measures that may tend to its REMOVAL.

"Resolved, That in all territory which may hereafter be added or acquired by the United States, where Slavery does not exist at the time of such addition or acquirement, neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, whereof the party has been duly convicted, ought ever to exist, but the same should ever remain free; and we are opposed to the extension of Slavery over any such territory; and that we also approve of the vote of our Senators and Representatives in Congress in favor of the Wilmot Proviso.

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, by all expedient and constitutional means and measures, to sustain the principles herein above set forth.

"MOSES NOBBS, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"HARRY HIBBARD,
President of the Senate.

"JARED W. WILLIAMS,
Governor."

In 1848, when an overwhelming majority in the Legislature, the New Hampshire Democracy again—

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Rep-

resentatives in General Court convened, That we are in favor of the passage of a law by Congress forever prohibiting Slavery in New Mexico and California, and in all other Territories now acquired, or hereafter to be acquired, by the United States, in which Slavery does not exist at the time of such acquisition.

"Resolved, That events have recently occurred, and are now transpiring at the seat of the General Government and elsewhere, which seem to make necessary a renewed expression of our views upon this subject.

"Resolved, That our Senators be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to urge the passage of such a law in relation to New Mexico and California; and that we approve, as we have always heretofore done, of all their votes already given in favor of such a law, or in favor of the principle of the same.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to forward a copy of the foregoing resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

"SAMUEL H. AYER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"HARRY HIBBARD,
President of the Senate.

"JARED W. WILLIAMS,
Governor."

When these resolutions were under consideration in the Senate, Hon. Harry Hibbard, (a gentleman from our State, who had something to do, I believe, with the passage of the Nebraska bill,) then President of the Senate, left the chair, and made a strong and earnest speech in their favor, from which I extract the following:

"He said he was ready at all times and places to sustain the principle of that amendment, (one stronger than the above, offered by Mr. Preston,) and believed this was the position of his political friends generally, not only in the Legislature, but throughout the State and the whole North. While they were disposed to abide by the provisions of the Constitution, and not seek to interfere with the institution of Slavery in the States; while they would not refuse desirable acquisitions of territory where Slavery already existed, for that reason alone, in the face of overwhelming considerations to the contrary, as in the case of Louisiana and Texas, they would oppose, by all constitutional means, the extension of Slavery over territory now free, as in the case of California and New Mexico. Such has been the Democratic faith from the days of Jefferson to the present time."

This is the same gentleman, Mr. Chairman, who, when the Nebraska bill was under discussion in this House, in the exuberance of his zeal to break down the barrier against the encroachments of Slavery, exclaimed to the patriotic men who were resisting the wicked act: "Bring in

"your couches, gentlemen; we are prepared to give you a long sitting!" But he has his reward! The New Hampshire Patriot, then, as now, the home organ of General Pierce, in commenting on these resolutions, used the following emphatic language in their favor:

"We need not say that these resolutions meet our hearty approbation, for our readers are aware that they contain the sentiments which we have contended for since we have been connected with this paper—the sentiments which the Democracy of this State have supported ever since the question of the extension of Slavery came up."

In 1849, the New Hampshire Democracy again defined their position on this question, in the following Legislative resolves:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That, opposed to every form of oppression, the people of New Hampshire have ever viewed with deep regret the existence of Slavery in this Union; that, while they have steadfastly supported all sections in their constitutional rights, they have not only lamented its existence as great social evil, but regarded it as fraught with danger to the peace and welfare of the nation.

"Resolved, That while we respect the rights of the slaveholding as well as the free portions of this Union—while we will not willingly consent that wrong be done to any member of the glorious Confederacy to which we belong, we are firmly and unalterably opposed to the extension of Slavery over any portion of American soil now free.

"Resolved, That, in our opinion, Congress has the constitutional power to abolish the slave trade and Slavery in the District of Columbia, and that our Senators be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to take all constitutional measures to accomplish these objects.

"SAMUEL H. AYER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"WILLIAM P. WEEKS,

President of the Senate.

"SAMUEL DINSMOOR,

Governor."

And the home organ of the President, the New Hampshire Patriot, on the 26th day of July, 1849, again referred to this subject in the following language:

"The Democracy of this State are unanimously in the opinion, so far as we know, that Congress has and should exercise the power, and exclude Slavery from California and New Mexico."

And all this, Mr. Chairman, from a State that, to its deep humiliation, has furnished for her free hills a President, who, by his agency in the wanton repeal of the Missouri Compromise, in the face of his published declarations, and in violation of pledges solemnly given before the nation, that the repose of the country should

not be disturbed by any act of his, has opened anew the flood-gates of sectional dissension and civil war, and caused an amount of wretchedness and suffering, to innocent men, women, and children, such as can scarcely be atoned for in a long life of repentance. Such was the position of the Northern Democracy, down to the passage of the famous Compromise Measures of 1850. At that time, California sought admission into the Union as a free State; and the Slave Power, again taking the alarm, raised a great outcry, and threatened, as usual, to dissolve the Union! They went so far as to issue a manifesto, and call a Convention at Nashville to take into consideration the subject of breaking up the Confederacy. But, sir, it ended pretty much in smoke, as all such attempts will, when they have for their basis no real cause of grievance. Many of the prominent men of that Convention are among the cherished leaders of the "Democracy" to-day; and one, at least, who was active in getting it up, holds a prominent place in the President's Cabinet. And here let me say, that although disunion sentiments have been vehemently and falsely charged upon the people of the free States, there has always been a disunion party at the South! The threats of dissolution, over and over again repeated in the Halls of Congress during the present session, have all come from men residing in that section of the country. And it is a significant fact, that all, or nearly all, the Calhoun men, Secessionists, Filibusters, and Disunionists, are now found, shoulder to shoulder, in the ranks of modern "Democracy."

The Compromise Measures were passed. The "bleeding wounds" of the country were healed. The whole question was finally "settled;" and thenceforward there was to be nothing but quiet and "repose" on the exciting subject of Slavery agitation. The Democratic party resolved, at Baltimore, that they would "resist," whether in Congress or out of Congress, all attempts to renew that agitation! General Pierce, in his first message, solemnly assured the country that by no act of his should this repose receive any shock during his term, if it was in his power to prevent it! How well this promise has been kept, let the wicked repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the long train of calamities which have followed that measure, and the excited state of the country at the present time, answer. The object and purpose of this repeal was not openly avowed at the time, although it was perfectly apparent that the extension of Slavery over the vast domain, from which it had been forever excluded by a solemn compact, was the real design of its instigators. It would not answer then to give the real and true reason for which its repeal was desired. But, by dint of party drill, it was put through, upon the false and fraudulent pretext that it was to inaugurate the great idea of "popular sovereignty." The country was deluded with the cry of "Let the people rule;"

for, in virtue of the provisions of the bill, it was said that the people of the Territories were to be left "perfectly free" to form their own institutions in their own way!

Mr. Chairman, I shall not dwell upon the wrongs and outrages perpetrated upon the unoffending people of Kansas. The repeated invasions of the Territory by ruffian marauders; the trampling down of the dearest right of American freemen—the right to have a voice in the making of their own laws—by armed force; the enactment of a bogus and bloody code, that would disgrace the Hottentots of Southern Africa; the driving of *bona fide* settlers from their claims; the dispersion of assemblages of peaceful citizens by United States troops; the sack of cities, and the driving from their homes of men, women, and children—compelling them to flee to the forests by the light of their burning dwellings; the cruel imprisonment of the leading men of the Territory, on the trumped-up charge of "constructive treason;" the wanton destruction of property; the thefts, and the cold-blooded murders—and all for the crime of loving Liberty better than Slavery—will forever constitute one the blackest pages in our country's history, and form a damning comment upon the "perfect freedom" which was granted to the people of Kansas, to mould their own institutions in their own way!

But, sir, the flimsy veil of "squatter sovereignty," with which the "true intent and meaning" of the Nebraska bill was sought to be disguised, is now thrown aside, and the real object of making Kansas a slave State, out of which three or four additional slave States can be carved, if necessary, is openly avowed by leading Democrats in Congress, and by Democratic presses in different parts of the country. That it may be seen I do not misrepresent in this matter, I shall produce extracts from various sources, in proof of the position I have assumed.

In the first place, I quote from the letter of a Mr. John Townsend, to a meeting held in Charleston, South Carolina, in March last, for the purpose of taking measures to forward emigration to Kansas from the South, from which it will be seen why the Slave Power are so anxious to obtain possession of Kansas:

"In gaining Kansas, we shut out an enemy from our camp; we support Missouri, and immeasurably strengthen our outposts on that important frontier; and, with her, we not only secure Missouri to our ranks, but the Indian Territory, which is large enough for two or three States, will cease to be debated ground, as it now is, and will be certain for the South.

"Kansas, then, is the Malakoff fortress, the taking of which will decide our victory in this battle with Abolitionism in that quarter—a battle in which from three to five States are to be the prizes to be won or lost to the South, and her cherished institutions."

But this does not rest upon the testimony of letter-writers, or of the Southern press merely. The same purpose was avowed, on the 23d day of June last, on the floor of the Senate, by Hon. JOSIAH EVANS, of South Carolina. I give an extract from his speech on that occasion:

"Was it strange, then, that the South should be alarmed at this state of things? I did not hear it; but I have understood that, in 1850, a Senator here from one of the free States said their object was to build a wall around Slavery—a wall of freemen, to render slave property unproductive, and to force its emancipation.

"Mr. BUTLER. 'Cordon' was the word.

"Mr. EVANS. *Well, sir, Kansas, although it is but one State when added, will be good against three more. And was it strange, then, that the South should desire possession of Kansas merely as a guarantee?* There is no pretence that they can occupy any other portion of that immense region"—(referring to Nebraska, New Mexico, and the Indian Territory, of which he had been speaking.)

"Everybody knows that Slavery will not do for a farming country merely. It is of no value in an agricultural country; it is of no value in the mechanic arts; it can only be used to advantage in the cultivation of the great staples. There is no pretence that any one of the great staples that constitute the great material of our foreign commerce can be cultivated anywhere within the limits of these Territories, *outside of the Territory of Kansas.*" * * * "*These, Mr. President, are the reasons why we desire Kansas; but it was not allowed.* The very instant it was opened to the slave population, that instant there sprung up a contrivance—a machinery was set in operation, of which I do not choose to speak—the object of which was to defeat this act of Congress, and, as was said by the Senator from Massachusetts, to devote this Territory to a free population."

Yes, sir; the great crime of the people of the free States consists in their wish to "devote this Territory to a FREE population!"

And here it is distinctly avowed, by a leading Democratic Senator, that the object in repealing the Missouri Compromise was, to take possession of Kansas as a slave State, and hold it as a "guarantee," to be cnt up into three more, as an offset to any free State that might be admitted from territory in which the institution of Slavery had already been solemnly prohibited by the votes as well of Southern as of Northern men! And when this "was not allowed," from the efforts made by Free State settlers to plant free institutions on the soil which belonged to them, and which had been consecrated to free labor by the compact of 1820, the attempt was made, and is still persisted in, to carry Slavery there by lawless violence, and at the point of

the bayonet! But I shall not confine myself merely to declarations of Southern men on this point. I quote from the speech of Hon. JOHN CADWALLADER, of Pennsylvania, made in this Hall on the 5th day of March last, in which some extraordinary revelations are made. He says:

"Justice required that the restriction (the 'Missouri restriction') should not be maintained eastward of those mountains, (the 'Rocky Mountains,') if it could not be extended westward of them to the Pacific."

Again:

"But as the Mexican laws locally in force had excluded Slavery from these Territories, (the Territories acquired from Mexico,) the application of this principle to them was illusory, so far as any possibility of participation in their further settlement by slaveholders might be concerned. Property in slaves was thus, in effect, excluded wholly from their limits. The principle of the former partitions having become inapplicable, and slaveholding settlers having been altogether excluded from this Territory, *the slaveholding States were, of right, entitled to an indemnification for their loss, if it could be afforded by giving to them access, with their slaves, to other Territory.*

"This principle was the moral basis of that *praiseworthy legislation of 1854, (the repeal of the Missouri Compromise,) which the chairman of the Committee on Territories has most injudiciously denominated a 'conspiracy against Freedom.'*"

But this is not all the gentleman says. I give one further extract:

"These examples, which might be multiplied, suffice to show the inconclusiveness of the general reasoning of those who assume, that whatever is legal is therefore necessarily rightful, in a moral or a political point of view, *and of the reasoning in particular of those who, conceiving the total exclusion of slaves from the Territories to be lawful, assume that such exclusion is therefore necessarily rightful.*

"Before concluding my remarks, I hope to show that such total exclusion would not only be IMMORAL and UNJUST, but would likewise, in a legal sense, be unconstitutional."

Sir, this is modern "Democracy" with a vengeance! Here we have the distinct avowal of a prominent "Democratic" leader from the North—from a *Pennsylvania* "Democrat," and, as I understand, an intimate personal friend of Mr. Buchanan—that the purpose of repealing the Missouri Prohibition was to give the slave States access to *Kansas with their slaves*; and this he calls the "praiseworthy legislation of 1854." Ay, sir, this Democrat from Mr. Buchanan's own State goes further than that, and proclaims the monstrous doctrine, that the total exclusion of Slavery from the free Territories is not only unconstitutional, but that it is "immoral and unjust!"

Sir, I thank the gentleman for the boldness with which he has avowed the Slavery creed of his party. And I call upon the people of the free States to mark the declaration, and to see *whither* modern Democracy would lead them. Sir, it has not always been the case, that Northern Democratic leaders have had the courage to come out squarely, and acknowledge their real purpose, and the effect of their principles upon this Slavery question. But

"Whom the gods seek to destroy, they first make mad;" and I rejoice that, for once, they intend to meet the issue fairly and boldly. If this is done, I have no fears of the result. Let the people of the free portion of this Union but understand the Democratic creed and platform, as it is understood and expounded by the leaders and presses of that party, especially at the South, and it will require affidavits in every free State of this Union to show that Mr. Buchanan has ever been a candidate for the Presidency.

But this is not the only Democratic leader from the North who adopts and sanctions this new and alarming doctrine. Another honorable gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania, [Mr. J. GLANCY JONES,] the particular friend and champion of Mr. Buchanan on this floor, occupies similar ground. He says:

"In my opinion, the Constitution *limits* the power of Congress to the extent of prohibiting them either from *establishing* or *abolishing* Slavery in the Territories. Admitting that view to be correct, I suppose it follows, as a matter of course, that the Constitution of the United States confers upon the people of the Territory no right to dispossess any man of his right to property, whether it be SLAVE or any other property. And therefore, the Legislative Council of a Territory, though they may pass laws regulating the disposal and protection of property, have no right to so administer those laws as to establish or abolish the right to hold that property."

The honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WARNER] scarcely goes further in his speech on the subject of Slavery in the Territories, which has been so often quoted, than do these expounders of Buchanan "Democracy" from the State of Pennsylvania. For the purpose of bringing out still more distinctly this new article of Democratic faith, I subjoin some extracts from the speech of the honorable gentleman from Georgia, made on this floor on the 1st day of April last:

"I shall maintain, and undertake to establish, that the title of my constituents to their slave property is not based upon any *positive* law of the State, but that it rests for its foundation upon the universal law of nations, which recognised slaves as *property*, before and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. That, before and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, the citizens of the State of Georgia—the same being a sovereign, in-

dependent State—had the undoubted right, according to the well-established principles of international law—to take their slave property into any foreign territory; provided there was no law in that foreign territory *prohibiting* its introduction there, and to have it protected in such foreign territory—that the law of nations was adopted as a part of the common law in the original thirteen States, constituting a part of the law of the land, before and at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution.

"It has been asserted, here and elsewhere, that Slavery exists in the States by force of *positive* law; and that whenever the owner takes his slave property beyond the territorial limits of such State, his title to that property ceases to be valid and operative for the protection of that property. I controvert this assumed proposition."

Again he says:

"Those great fundamental rights which I have been discussing belonged to the people of the States before and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. They entered into, and constituted an essential element of, their title to their slave property, part and parcel of it; and not having delegated them in the Constitution, they have them now; and *and it is by virtue of those pre-existing rights, which are solemnly guaranteed by the Constitution, that my constituents claim to be entitled to take their slave property into the common territory, and to have it protected there.*"

But I will make one more extract from the Democratic speech of the honorable gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. WARNER,] which I commend to the careful consideration of the people of the free States. It discloses the reason why the Slave Power is so insatiate and aggressive, and, like the daughters of the horse-leech, constantly crying, "Give! give!"

"But, sir, we have been told, by those who advocate this line of policy, that they do not desire to interfere with Slavery in the States where it exists; and yet it is their intention to prevent the extension of Slavery by excluding it from the common territory—to surround the slave States 'with a cordon of free territory, and compel Slavery, like a serpent, to sting itself to death!' Now, it matters but little, with me, whether a man takes my property outright, or restricts me in the enjoyment of it, so as to render it of but little or no value to me. It is an interference with my rights in either case; the interference is one of degree only. Any restraint upon the use and enjoyment of my property in as full and ample manner as I might otherwise do, but for the restriction, is an interference with it. There is not a slaveholder, in this House or out of it, but who knows perfectly well, that whenever Slavery is confined within certain specified limits, its future existence is

doomed; it is only a question of time as to its final destruction. You may take any single slaveholding county in the Southern States, in which the great staples of cotton and sugar are cultivated to any extent, and confine the present slave population within the limits of that county. Such is the rapid natural increase of the slaves, and the rapid exhaustion of the soil in the cultivation of those crops, (which add so much to the commercial wealth of the country,) that in a few years it would be impossible to support them within the limits of such county. Both master and slave would be *starved out!* and what would be the practical effect in any one county, the same result would happen to all the slaveholding States. Slavery cannot be confined within certain specified limits, without producing the destruction of both master and slave; it requires fresh lands, plenty of wood and water, not only for the comfort and happiness of the slave, but for the benefit of the owner."

Slavery, according to the honorable gentleman, in order to prevent being "starved out," constantly requires "fresh lands, and plenty of wood and water." It is frequently said, at the North, that we can do nothing there towards ridding the country of the evils of Slavery. But here it is admitted, by one who knows, that if the system were restricted within its present limits, it would die of itself. Suppose, by so restricting it, the people of the States where it now exists should be compelled to find some mode for its complete abolition, and the substitution of free labor in its place—where would be the great sin in all this? But no; modern "Democracy" says: Break down the barrier that for thirty-four years has been erected against this giant curse, which exhausts the soil, and at whose touch every green thing withers; and give it "fresh lands, and plenty of wood and water," until these also are exhausted, and other "fresh lands" are demanded, to satisfy the cravings of its rapacious appetite! But this doctrine of the honorable gentleman goes further than this. If it be wrong to restrict Slavery within its present limits, because, if so confined, it will "sting itself to death," there is no reason why its expansion should be limited to the Territories. When these are used up, or for any cause, in order to insure its vitality, it wants more "room," why not spread itself into the free States? The carrying out of this doctrine would lead to the practical establishment of Slavery there. It needs but one more triumph of the Slave Power, in the coming election, to have the doctrine of Judge Kane confirmed by the Supreme Court, and Slavery is virtually established in every free State of the Union.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to give a few more extracts from leading Democrats, to illustrate further this doctrine of "State equality,"

and to show the utter abandonment, by the Democratic party, of the doctrine of "popular sovereignty," which was used with such effect to bewilder and delude the people.

I give an extract from the speech of a distinguished Democratic Senator, the honorable A. G. BROWN, of Mississippi, delivered in the Senate, April 28, 1856:

"The advocates of State rights have always held that the Territories are the common property of the States; that one State has the same interest in them as another; and that a citizen of one State has the same right to go to them as a citizen of any other State. *The corollary therefore has been, that a citizen of any one State has the same right as a citizen of any other State to go into the Territories, and take with him whatever is recognised as property in the State from which he goes. Thus, if a citizen of Massachusetts may go and take with him a bale of goods, a citizen of Tennessee may go and take a barrel of whisky; and if a citizen of New York may go and take a horse, a citizen of Mississippi may go and take a slave. It must be so, or else the equality of the parties is destroyed. Tennessee becomes inferior to Massachusetts, and the rights of a Mississippian are inferior to those of a New Yorker.*

"This doctrine finds opposition in many quarters. It is opposed by Free-Soilers and by the advocates of that uncertain theory which some call Territorial sovereignty; others, popular sovereignty; and others again, squatter sovereignty—a theory which the author of this bill so well combats in the declaration that 'the sovereignty of a Territory remains in abeyance, suspended in the United States, in trust for the people, until they shall be admitted into the Union as a State.' To this declaration I give my assent."

It will be seen, by this extract, that Mr. DOUGLAS himself has abandoned this favorite invention of his.

If any further proof were necessary to show that this talk about "popular sovereignty," which will still be harped upon in the North as the great principle for which the "Democracy" are contending, is repudiated as an exploded humbug by those who pull the wires in this campaign, it is to be found in the fact that the following amendment to Mr. DOUGLAS's new bill to make Kansas a slave State, proposed by Senator TRUMBULL, of Illinois, to test the sincerity of those who profess so much reverence for "popular sovereignty," was, on the morning of the 3d of the present month, voted down in the Senate, thirty four Senators, including Mr. DOUGLAS and all the Democratic Senators, voting against it, with only nine in its favor:

"Sec. —. *And be it further enacted, That it was the true intent and meaning of the 'Act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas,' not to legislate Slavery into Kansas,*

'nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free, through their Territorial Legislature, to regulate the institution of Slavery in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States; and that, until the Territorial Legislature acts upon the subject, the owner of a slave in one of the States has no right or authority to take such slave into the Territory of Kansas, and there hold him as a slave; but every slave taken into the Territory of Kansas by his owner, for the purpose of settlement, is hereby declared to be free, unless there is some valid act of a duly constituted Legislative Assembly of said Territory, under and by virtue of which he may be held as a slave.'

Here was an opportunity to define distinctly this doctrine of "popular sovereignty." If it meant anything—if it was not intended merely as a *cheat*—it meant what is set forth in this amendment. If Mr. DOUGLAS and other Democratic Senators were sincere in their talk about "popular sovereignty," why not, when different interpretations have been put upon it at the North and at the South, honestly say, as proposed by this amendment, that every slave taken into Kansas by his owner, for the purpose of settlement, should be free, unless declared to be a slave by the act of the people, through their Territorial Legislature? This would be *genuine* "squatter sovereignty," allowing the people the right to establish or prohibit Slavery, as they might choose. But the leaders of the "Democracy" know that no such "squatter sovereignty" as this is intended! Let it be understood that the *people of a Territory* have the right to abolish Slavery, that *such* is the meaning of the term "popular sovereignty," and this beautiful "Democratic" organization could not hold together a single day! The Slave Power will not tolerate a principle that gives to Freedom any *chance* in the Territories, even under the absurd and precarious doctrine of "squatter sovereignty." It was always regarded as a *humbug* at the South; but in order to accomplish its purpose, and deceive the North, it was necessary to invent some high-sounding phrase, to tickle the popular ear; and therefore, when the Nebraska Bill was passed, "popular sovereignty" was the cry! Having done its work, the new slogan of "State equality" is made to take its place, by virtue of which, if the "Democracy" can again succeed in hoodwinking the people, Kansas and the other Territories are to be made *SLAVE STATES*! This amendment was therefore voted down, every "Democratic" Senator voting against it—showing that the interpretation put upon DOUGLAS's report by Senator BROWN (which I referred to a short time since) was the true one, and that "popular sovereignty" is no longer an article in the "Democratic" creed!

At the bidding of the Slave Power, the

"Democratic" party were required to repudiate this doctrine, in the Cincinnati platform, because, under it, Liberty *might*, by some remote possibility, obtain a foothold in some of the Territories! Hear what the Hon. Mr. KEITT, of South Carolina, said on this subject, before the Cincinnati Convention was held:

"The South should establish in the platform the principle that the right of a Southern man to his slave is equal, in its length and breadth, to the right of a Northern man to his horse. She should make the recognition of the right full, complete, and indisputable."

I give, also, an extract from the *Richmond Enquirer*, on the same subject:

"We must, in the Cincinnati platform, repudiate squatter sovereignty, and expressly assert State equality. We must declare that it is the duty of the General Government to see that no invidious or injurious distinctions are made between the people or the property of different sections in the Territories. We do not mean to dictate. It may be that the assertion in the platform of the abstract proposition of State equality may suffice to carry along with it the consequences which we desire. But it is often charged that the Kansas-Nebraska bill contains the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, and that squatter sovereignty is the most efficient agent of Free-Soilism. Some Northern Democrats have maintained this ground. Now, this gun must be spiked. It must appear from our platform that we maintain practical State equality, and repudiate that construction of the Kansas-Nebraska act which would defeat it. The South only demand equality of right. The more clearly it appears that the Northern Democracy is ready to concede it to her, the more certain is our candidate of success."

That the Slave Power got at Cincinnati all it demanded, will be seen from what was said by the same paper, soon after the nomination of Mr. Buchanan. I read again from the *Richmond Enquirer*:

"With the utmost possible precision and emphasis of language, these resolutions affirm the great vital principles, first, of the constitutional guarantees of Slavery; and secondly, of the equality of the States, in respect of their sovereign dignity and political rights. In equally clear and conclusive terms, the doctrine of squatter sovereignty is repudiated by the platform of the Democratic party."

On this platform, Mr. Buchanan made haste to plant himself; and in his ecstasy of delight at the principles embraced in it, he is willing to lose his own personal identity, and become wholly absorbed in the platform. He is no longer simply JAMES BUCHANAN, but the embodiment of the new "Democratic" creed. This is the language he uses in his address to the Keystone Club, at Wheatland, in Pennsylvania:

"I have been placed upon a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct according to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank nor take one from it."

Whatever Mr. Buchanan's followers may attempt to say of him in the free States, such is the Slavery-extension platform on which he is placed! And that there need be no possible mistake as to his soundness in regard to it, I have only to make one further extract from Hon. Preston S. Brooks, of South Carolina, which puts his orthodoxy beyond question. Hear Mr. Brooks:

"Mr. Buchanan was neither my first nor second choice for the Presidency; but, as the representative of a type of principles, and standing boldly, as he does, upon the Baltimore platform, upon which General Pierce was carried into power—enlarged, improved, and strengthened, as it has been by the supplemental resolutions adopted at Cincinnati, and by which resolutions our principles, as practically applied to the Territory of Kansas, have been re-endorsed by the American Democracy, and by their nominee—I could not be unfaithful to the man, without treachery to the principles he represents."

If any additional evidence were wanting to show Mr. Buchanan's complete and thorough identification with the most ultra and extreme views of the South, it is furnished in the zealous support given to him by Governor Wise, of Virginia, who preferred Mr. Buchanan to even General Pierce or Stephen A. Douglas, on account of his peculiar soundness on the Slavery question. In his late speech at Richmond, Governor Wise says:

"He has been especially faithful on the subject of Slavery. I undertake to say that not only no man North, but no man South, can show a better record than that of James Buchanan on that vexed and dangerous question. * * *

"His friends, of Pennsylvania, in nominating him at Harrisburg, had, excluding the idea of squatter sovereignty, adopted the principle of non-intervention by Congress to prevent or to exclude Slavery; and of STATE EQUALITY in the Territories; * * * and immediately upon his return home, he adopted their nomination of him, placed on this platform. This was identification enough with that measure."

Mr. Wise goes on to prove, that on every question touching Slavery, Mr. Buchanan has always gone with the South; and the above extracts will show that he not only adopts the platform laid down for him, but adopts also the Southern interpretation of it, to wit, that "squatter sovereignty" means nothing, and "State equality" means the right of slave-owners to take their slaves to any of the free

Territories of the nation, and there hold them, under the protection of law!

I have thus, sir, shown the position now occupied by the Democratic party before the country. I have shown what is understood by the leading principles of its platform. The ground taken is a bold one, and should be met by freemen with equal boldness and determination. The Slave Power, which now acts through the Democratic organization, makes no further apologies for Slavery. It admits no longer that it is in any sense an evil; but, with a bravery worthy a better cause, it defiantly proclaims it to be right—a blessing both to the master and the slave, and claims the right to go anywhere with its property in *human flesh*, upon the same terms of equality which we of the free States possess, to go with what is everywhere regarded as property by the general sense and judgment of mankind! Sir, what is this “right,” which the Slave Power, with such a show of indignation at its denial, claims to have put upon the same footing with property in the free States? It is the right, if I may be allowed the solecism, to perpetrate a *wrong*. It is the right to plant upon the free soil of this great Republic a system which makes of man an article of merchandise, and stamps him with the seal of perpetual degradation; and this, too, in violation of plighted faith, of the long-established doctrines of the common law, and of the Constitution of the United States. It is the right to subject to Slavery there, not merely the *negro*, but it claims that the hateful badge should not be confined to *color* or *race*. For proof of this, I quote once more from the *Richmond Enquirer*:

“Until *recently*, the defence of Slavery has labored under great difficulties, because its defenders have taken half-way grounds. They confined the defence of Slavery to *mere negro slavery*, thereby giving up the Slavery principles, admitting *other forms* to be wrong, and yielding up the authority of the Bible, and practice and experience of mankind. Human experience, showing the universal success of slave society, and *the universal failure of free society*, was unavailable to them, because they were precluded from employing it, by admitting Slavery, in the abstract, to be wrong. But now the line of defence is changed. The South now maintains that Slavery is *RIGHT, natural, and necessary*. Whilst it is far more obvious that negroes should be slaves than whites, for they are only *fit to labor*, [to reverse this argument, it would seem that all the labor is only fit for slaves,] yet the *principle of Slavery is itself right, and does not depend on difference of complexion*. Difference of *race* tends to render the institution more natural and durable.”

Sir, I represent a constituency of NORTHERN LABORERS—men who deem it no disgrace that they earn their subsistence, and lay up a com-

petence for support in after life, by their daily labor. So far as social position is concerned, they are the peers of any man on this floor, North or South. And I will resist, by all the powers that God has given me, the extension of a system into their territory which degrades them to the level of the negro slave, and which holds that all who labor, whether black or white, are fit only to be slaves themselves!

Sir, the abstract proposition contended for by the Slave Power, to wit: that they have the same right to go into the Territories with *their* property, that we of the free States have with ours, has, at first blush, some show of speciousness. But it rests upon the false assumption that, by the general law of nature and of nations, there is, or can be, such a thing as property in human beings. The premises being thus assumed, the conclusion follows, as a matter of course. But this is not true. Beyond the limits of the local law, there is no such thing as property in man. It is but recently that this proposition has been denied. Until recently, Liberty was always considered the rule, and Slavery the exception; and it was generally conceded that Slavery could only exist where it was *established* by positive law. But now, according to the doctrine proclaimed the other day by the honorable gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS,] Slavery exists wherever it is not expressly *prohibited*—thereby completely reversing the generally-received opinion upon this subject. Thus, one after another, the old landmarks of Freedom are removed. The repeal of the Missouri restriction only made way for the abrogation of the universal rule, that Slavery is the creature of local law, and confined to the States where it unfortunately exists. This doctrine is, as I have said, familiar and well established. It has been recognised as the doctrine of the common law, from the time of the decision of the Somerset case in England, not merely by decisions there and in other foreign jurisdictions, but by the courts in slave as well as free States of this Union. This beneficent feature of the common law is beautifully expressed by one of the great English poets:

“Slaves cannot breathe in England; if their lungs
Perceive our air, that moment they are free,
They touch our country, and their shackles fall!”

Such is the law in this country; and it has been over and over again decided that slaves, taken voluntarily beyond the State where Slavery exists, at once become free. I will not consume the time in citing authorities. They are to be found in the reports of the United States courts, in the decisions of the courts of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Kentucky, and of many of the free States. But nothing is too sacred for Slavery to call in question—nothing so well established as to interpose any barrier to its onward and deadly march! It could not go to Kansas in safety until it was first established that slaves could be held beyond the range of the local law; and at once the judicial barrier

which confined them to the States where Slavery exists by such law, was attacked and repudiated!

If, then, as has been shown, Slavery has no legal existence beyond the municipal law of the State where it is established, it follows that slaves cannot be taken into the Territories, and there held as slaves, except in violation of the Constitution. The Constitution nowhere regards slaves as property; but in every instance where they are referred to, they are treated as persons. To show that I am right in this, I quote from the decision of the court in the case of *Jones vs. Van Zandt*, (2 *McLean's United States Circuit Court Reports*,) as follows:

"The Constitution treats slaves as PERSONS. The view of Mr. Madison, who thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men, seems to have been carried out in that most important instrument. Whether slaves are referred to in it as the basis of representation, as migrating, or being imported, or as fugitives from labor, they are spoken of as PERSONS."

So that, if slaves are taken into the Territories, they go as persons; and by the fifth article of the amendments to the Constitution, which provides that no PERSON "shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," they ought at once to be set free. But the Slave Power scouts this doctrine; denies that there is any power in the people of the Territories to prohibit Slavery therein; and contends that, by virtue of the provisions of this very Constitution, Slavery is established there the moment a slaveholder sets his foot upon the

soil with his slaves! It is understood that a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States are ready with an opinion, confirming the Slavery side of this question.

There is, then, Mr. Chairman, but one hope left for Freedom in Kansas, and that the people of this country are about to avail themselves of. It is, to wrest from the hands of the slave Democracy the power they have abused, and vest it in those who will bring back the Administration of the Government to the early policy of its founders!

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that we seek no quarrel with our brethren of the South. This is an issue which *they* have forced upon *us*, and, with God's blessing, we will meet it as becomes worthy descendants of patriot sires! You sometimes tell us that all you want is to be let alone. That is precisely what we intend to do. We will interfere with none of your rights. Whatever is "nominated in the bond," that we will yield. In turn, is it too much for us to make the same request of *you*—that you will let *us* alone? If Slavery be a blessing, to you shall inure all its benefits. If it be a curse, do not seek to plant it upon our soil—to involve us in its guilt. We desire to cultivate the relations of peace and of fraternal kindness with the people of the South. And we say to them, in the language of one of New England's most gifted poets:

"All that sister States *should* do, all that FREE States may,
Heart, hand, and purse, we proffer, as in our early day;
But this one, dark, loathsome burden, ye must struggle
with ALONE,
And reap the bitter harvest which ye yourselves have
sown!"